

REMARKS

In the Office Action (mailed on March 18, 2003) claims 9-11 and 40-43 were allowed. Claims 19, 20, 23-27, 29-32 34 and 35 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Office Action stated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-8, 12-18, 21, 22, 28, 33, 36-39 and 44-47 were rejected.

Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for claim 15. The specification has been amended in the paragraph at page 8, lines 16-21 to provide support for such claim. Support for such amendment to specification is found in claim 15 as filed.

Objection to Claim 40

Claim 40 was objected to with an indication that in line 9, "direct" should be changed to "directed." Claim 40 has been amended to correct this informality. Review and approval are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 8, 14, and 46 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 8, 14, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Regarding claims 8 and 46, the Office Action indicates that the specification does not describe the claimed feature, "wherein, for calls with the subscriber located in a region other than the geographic region to which the subscriber is assigned, billing information is passed to the existing network regarding location of the subscriber only through the interface that serves the

region to which the subscriber is assigned," adequately enough to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention. The specification has been amended to provide support for the disclosure of claims 8 and 46 in the paragraph at page 8, line 22 – page 9, line 4. One skilled in the art would know how to pass billing information given such disclosure. Support for such amendment is found in claims 8 and 46 as filed.

Regarding claim 14, the Office Action indicates that the specification does not describe the claimed feature, "wherein communication between the circuitry coupled to the set of interfaces and the subscriber takes place entirely over a land line system." The Office Action indicates that the specification discloses that the subscriber is a mobile subscriber that communicates wirelessly with radio transceivers. However, it is noted that the present specification at page 23, lines 2-8 discusses a cable television network that does not necessarily require a mobile subscriber. Thus, wireless communication is not necessarily required. For example, in the case of a cable television system, the subscriber's device may be moved to a different region. Once the device is moved, however, it may communicate without wireless, e.g., entirely through a land line system. Similarly, a subscriber that communicates in a PSTN system may move, and then communicate through the land line system at the subscriber's new location. The specification has been amended, based on the disclosure of claim 14, in the paragraph starting at page 3, line 22 and in the paragraph starting at page 23, line 3. Support for such amendment is found in claim 14 as filed. Non-wireless networks are known by those skilled in the art. Thus, one skilled in the art would be sufficiently enabled to make and/or use the invention of claim 14 in view of Applicant's application as filed.

It is believed that the specification is enabled with respect to claims 8, 14, and 46, given that one skilled in the art would know how to make the invention claimed, in view of the

application as filed. Because the above amendments are supported by the application and specification as filed, no new matter has been added to the present specification. Thus, the specification and the respective claims have been enabled as of the filing date of the present application. It is therefore believed that the rejection of claims 8, 14, and 46 has been overcome and removal of such rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-8 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action indicates that claim 1 recites the limitation "the various geographic regions" in line 5. The Office Action indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Office Action further indicates claims 2-8 depend on claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to change "the geographic regions" to "geographic regions" to overcome this rejection. It is believed that the respective rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 has been overcome and the removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 12, 13, 16-18, 21, 22, 28, 33, 36-39, 44, 45 and 47 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 12, 16-18, 21, 22, 36-38, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,978,678 (Houde). Claims 4, 5, 13, 28, 33, 39, 45, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Houde in view of "well known prior art." Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Houde in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,854 (Focarile). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Office Action's characterization of the references and well known prior art. However, to expedite furtherance of the present application to allowance, Applicant has made certain amendments as discussed below. Applicant reserves the right to pursue such claims in their original form in a later application.

Applicant traverses the Office Action's statements regarding "well known prior art." Applicant does not believe that such combinations would be known or obvious to one skilled in the art, for example the Office Action's statement regarding the most efficient routing paths and the other statements regarding "well known prior art." Applicant requests that the Examiner provide documentary evidence to support any assertions regarding such art if the Examiner persists in relying on such assertions.

Claim 1 has been amended to add subject matter from claim 19. The Office Action indicated that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. For at least the reason that claim 1 contains subject matter from allowable claim 19, it is believed that claim 1 as amended is in form for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests review and approval of claim 1 as amended. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 1. Further it is believed that such claims are independently patentable. Therefore, removal of the rejection of claims 2-8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 was allowed in the Office Action. Certain features based on claim 9 have been added to claim 12. Review and approval of claim 12 as amended is therefore respectfully requested. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 12 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 12. It is also believed that such claims are independently patentable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 13-16 be removed.

Claim 17 has been amended to add the features of claim 19. The Office Action indicated that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 17 thus represents such an amendment to claim 19. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 17 be removed. Claims 18-32 depend directly or indirectly from claim 17 and are therefore believed patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 17. It is also believed that such claims are independently patentable. Therefore, removal of the rejection of such claims 18-32 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action indicated that claim 34 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 33 has been amended to add the features of claim 34. Therefore, it is believed that claim 33 is allowable and the rejection of such claim should be removed.

Claim 35 depends from claim 33 and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 33. Further, the Office Action has indicated that claim 35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 35 be removed.

Claim 36 has been amended to include subject matter from claim 34, which the Office Action has indicated would be allowable. Applicant therefore respectfully requests review and approval of amended claim 36. Claims 37-39 depend from claim 36 and are therefore believed patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 36. It is also believed that such claims are independently patentable. Therefore, removal of the rejection of claims 36-39 is respectfully requested.

Claim 44 has been amended to include certain features from allowed claim 9. Review and approval of amended claim 44 is respectfully requested. Claims 45-46 depend from

claim 44 and are therefore believed patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 44. Removal of the rejection of claims 45-46 is therefore respectfully requested.

Amended claim 47 contains features from claim 19, which the Office Action indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Removal of the rejection of claim 47 is respectfully requested.

Allowed claims 9-11 and 40-43

The Examiner has allowed claims 9-11 and 40-43.

Allowable Claims 9-11, 40-43, 19, 20, 23-27, 29-32, 34, and 35

Claims 19, 20, 23-27, 29-32, 34, and 35 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Such claims are discussed above and in the following remarks.

New claims 48-51

New claims 48-51 have been added. Such claims are believed patentable for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Office Action indicated that claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New claim 48 is based on claim 23 and its parent claim. Approval of such new claim is respectfully requested.

The Office Action indicated that claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New claim 49 is based on claim 24 and its parent claim. Approval of such new claim is respectfully requested.

OFFICIAL

The Office Action indicated that claim 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New claim 50 is based on claim 29 and its parent claim. Approval of such new claim is respectfully requested.

The Office Action indicated that claim 35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New claim 51 is based on original claim 35 and its parent claim. Approval of such new claim is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

Date: August 6, 2003
George A. Wolman, Reg. No. 41,378

650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
(650) 493-9300 (general)
(650) 320-4945 (direct)
Customer No. 021971